

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 22, 1999 LB 835

regional, if not national. And what information comes from a state or many states is going to be the same for all of us, eventually. There's no point in having excessive information in Nebraska, if we don't know what Kansas, Iowa particularly, which is the largest hog feeding state, North Carolina, if we don't have that uniform information, it really means nothing. So, there is no reason to doubt that nationally we'll not have the kind of information that we should have, whether you're in Nebraska, Kansas, or any other state in the country.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Wehrbein, I understand what you're saying, and it's eminently wise and practical. But I think the federal government could have done something eminently wise and practical before now. The only reason it's being considered, I think the packers are starting to see that individual states are going to do things, and that will be more difficult for them to deal with than national legislation. Thank you. And I'll ask Senator Brashear a question or two now.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Brashear, would you yield?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, Mr. President.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Brashear, if there is not a preemption provision in the federal legislation, that would mean that every state is still free to have its own standards and requirements. Is that true?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, Senator Chambers.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Based on whatever information you have, and you may not know, because I'm not sure, what is your understanding about a preemption provision in the federal legislation that...that...we don't know the details of it, so I'm not asking for that.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: It is my understanding that what is being talked about...and my understanding is also like that of Senator Wehrbein, as just recited, in terms of the probabilities of it or possibility or probability.. It's my understanding we're